

# **Asset Management System Estatesman**

End of Project Report

**Document:** End of Project Report  
**Issue Date:** 08/01/10  
**Version:** Final  
**Version Number:** 1.0  
**Author:** Kevin Rump

## **Purpose**

---

The information in the Mandate is used to trigger *Starting up a project (SU)*". It should contain sufficient information to identify at least the prospective Executive of the Project Board and indicate the subject matter of the project. It will be used to create the Project Brief.

## **Derivation**

---

A Project Mandate may come from anywhere, but it should come from a level of management that can authorise the cost and resource usage. It is input to *Starting Up a Project (SU)*.

## **Quality Criteria**

---

- The level of authority is commensurate with the anticipated size, risk and cost of the project

## **Contents**

---

Contents .....	1
1 Project Objective.....	2
2 Review of Benefits Achieved to date (if any) .....	2
3 Performance Against Tolerances.....	3
4 Effect on Project Plan & Business Case .....	3
5 Final Statistics on Project Issues/Risks .....	3
6 Post implementation Review Plan/Date (if any) .....	4

## 1 Project Objective

**Project Sponsor:** Ray Johnson

**Project Manager:** Kevin Rump

- ★ To procure an Asset Management System by the end of December 2008 ✓
- ★ To implement the chosen Asset Management System by March 2009 ✗
  - Delivered 1 month late
  - System implemented and available but incomplete upload of data/hard copies and limited skill sharing amongst team.

## 2 Review of Benefits Achieved to date (if any)

Benefits	Status/Date
Multiple Images available Online - has a saving of £253 per year (from yr 2). These 2 days to be used on generating more income.	Not realised
Reduction in paper generation - has a saving of admin time £380 per year + £20 Paper/inks per year.	Not realised
Accessibility of Evidence - has saving of admin time £1,088 per year from year 2	Not realised
Survey Storage and accessibility - Cost avoidance of £100 per month from year 2	Not realised
Financial reputation - Cost avoidance of 12k per year from yr2	Not realised
Multi-skilled personnel - It is felt that by multi-skilling that these days can be gained back into the service. Cost avoidance of £1,360 per year	Not realised
Rent/lease renewals. Has a saving of £3,000 admin time per year + cost avoidance of lost income of £60,000 per year from year 2	Not realised
Avoidance of information loss - service easy to recover in the event of a disaster.	Not realised
Management of "voids"	Not realised
Trading Opportunities	Not realised
Mobile Working opportunities	Not realised
Historic data transfer - the ability to upload historic information	Not realised
Management via online Fee Charge Calculator	Not realised
An increase in staff morale due to better and more efficient processes	Not realised
Opportunities open up as a result of trading	Not realised
The enabling of Mobile Working opportunities	Not realised
An increase in staff morale due to better and more efficient processes	Not realised

### 3 Performance Against Tolerances

	Tolerance Level Agreed at outset	Status Update
Time	To procure an Asset Management System by the end of Dec 2008.	Achieved
	Implement the chosen Asset Management System by March 2009.	Late 1 month
Cost	Must not exceed costs £30k capital costs.	Achieved
Quality	Specification must be delivered in full.	P1 Achieved
Scope	To procure system, implement, and obtain customer acceptance.	Partly Achieved
Benefits	No tolerance set.	N/A
Risk	Any high likelihood/high impact risk to be escalated.	Achieved

### 4 Effect on Project Plan & Business Case

ID	Products	Status	Planned Finish	Actual Finish
1	Agree Contract	Completed	Dec 08	Jan 09
2	Prepare infrastructure	Completed	Dec 08	Jan 09
3	Site Survey	Completed	Jan 09	Mid Jan 09
4	Install Test System	Completed	Jan 09	Late Jan 09
5	Prep data	Completed	Dec 08	Jan 09
6	Data Migration	Partly completed	Jan 09	Ongoing
7	Breckland Testing	Completed	Feb 09	Mar 09
8	Sign-off	Completed	Feb 09	Apr 09
9	Training	Completed	Feb 09	March 09
10	Install Live System	Completed	Feb 09	March 09
11	Parallel Running	Partly Completed	Feb 09	Ongoing

### 5 Final Statistics on Project Issues/Risks

#### Issues

- ★ Total issues Raised = 42 (5 top, 14 high, 20 medium, 3 low)
- ★ Outstanding Issues:
  - Code book work that Joan carried out has not been tested by the team - issue also highlights resource concerns or ability to remove from day-to-day line duties
  - It is still unclear for the key resource Paul Durrant as to what is the definitive list for a "complete record" and this causes problems in that Paul does not have a direction to work towards
  - Due to the delays in entering information by the team there are concerns that re-training would be required.
  - Paul is the key resource and is struggling with the conflict of line v project duties. There is a reliance upon 1 resource which makes the project difficult to progress quickly
  - Reluctance for the team to start using the system early
  - Loss of drive to embrace the system through team morale, change in sponsorship and other priorities.
- ★ Off-specification issues:

- Financial module was not part of the offer but the team think it is important in order to deliver the trading platform.
- Concerns that service charges are not accounted for in the system

### Risks

★ Total risks raised at project outset = 12

Sort by Risk %/Likelihood		Initial assessment		Update following project end
ID	Risk	%	Impact	
6	The final system is not fit for purpose.	High	Medium	<b>Increased Risk</b> Change in trading vision Change in sponsorship
11	The system(s) can not integrate / interface with the financial and GIS systems as required.	High	Medium	<b>Reduced Risk</b> Commitment from supplier obtained
2	Inadequate supplier management	Medium	Medium	No Difference
12	Given the uncertainties regarding the local government review any system purchased could be redundant in 18 months time.	Medium	Medium	No Difference
5	Project roles and responsibilities not clearly identified.	Medium	Medium	No Difference
1	Failure of supplier to meet deadlines	Medium	Medium	<b>Avoided</b> N/a
7	Key team members are unavailable or leave the organisation.	Medium	Medium	<b>Increased Risk</b> Change in trading vision Change in sponsorship
8	Management incompetence - lack of drive for the project.	High	Low	No Difference
9	Collapse of supplier	High	Low	No Difference
10	Budget affected - more funds required to complete the project.	High	Low	<b>Avoided</b> N/a
4	Poor Staff take up of new system	High	Low	<b>Increased Risk</b> Loss of enthusiasm Other priorities
3	Scope creep - additional workload	Medium	Low	<b>Increased Risk</b> Change in sponsorship has affected the needs of the project

## **6 Post implementation Review Plan/Date (if any)**

---

To be confirmed